

-18-

REMARKS

The Examiner has revised the current rejection in light of new prior art. While applicant continues to disagree with the Examiner, applicant has incorporated the subject matter of at least one dependent claim into each of the independent claims in the spirit of expediting the prosecution of the present application. Since the subject matter of such dependent claim was already considered by the Examiner, it is asserted that such claim amendments would not require new search and/or consideration.

Claims 1-66 stand rejected under 35 USC §103 as being obvious over "Symantec System Center Implementation Guide" (hereinafter "Symantec") in view of Chen (U.S. Patent 5,960,170) and further in view of Brown ("Data Communications"). Applicant respectfully disagrees with such rejection, particularly in view of the amendments made hereinabove. Specifically, applicant has amended each of the independent claims to include the subject matter of former dependent Claim 7 et al.

Previously, the Examiner has relied on page 18 of "Symantec" and the following excerpts from Chen to meet applicant's claimed technique "wherein said data retrieving logic and said report sending logic use an internet URL to specify said requested data to said receiving computer, said internet URL also containing said report data to be sent to said receiving computer" (see this or similar, but not necessarily identical language in each of the independent claims).

"The conventional protocols of the network, such as the WAN in the embodiment of FIG. 1, are used to route the request from the client 300 to the virus detection server 400. For example, the request can implement a uniform resource locator (URL) address corresponding to the virus detection server 400. Once contact is initiated, conventional protocols, such as the HTTP and FTP referenced above, are used to transfer information between the virus detection server 400 and the client 300. Various alternatives for the establishment of a connection between the client 300 and the virus detection server 400 can be provided. The request for a virus scan can also be routed through a separate server that handles initial requests and, possibly, validates them before passing the client 300 to the virus detection server 400 (and thus the request and the validation would be received together by the virus detection server 400).

-19-

Additionally, although a connection with and resultant virus detection and treatment for a single client is generally described, a single virus scan request that is received by the virus detection server 400 can cause the server 400 to detect and treat viruses on a plurality of clients 300, such as all of the clients 300b residing on a given local area network." (see col. 6, lines 49-57)

Such excerpt from Chen merely suggests that a request can implement a uniform resource locator (URL) address corresponding to a virus detection server. This clearly falls short of applicant's claimed technique "wherein said data retrieving logic and said report sending logic use an internet URL to specify said requested data to said receiving computer, said internet URL also containing said report data to be sent to said receiving computer" (emphasis added), as claimed. Only applicant teaches and claims an internet URL that is used to specify requested data to a receiving computer and also contains report data to be sent to a receiving computer. Simply nowhere in the prior art is there such a combination of features and components for using a URL for both specifying requested data and reporting data by specifically containing report data to be sent to a receiving computer in the URL.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed.Cir.1991).

Applicant respectfully asserts that at least the third element of the *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been met, since the prior art references, when combined, fail to teach or suggest all of the claim limitations, as noted above. A notice of allowance or a specific prior art showing of all of such limitations, in combination with the remaining

-20-

claim elements, is respectfully requested.

Thus, all of the independent claims are deemed allowable. Moreover, the remaining dependent claims are further deemed allowable, in view of their dependence on such independent claims.

In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 505-5100. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1351 (Order No. NAIIP459/01.021.01).

Respectfully submitted,
Zilka-Kotab, PC.

Kevin J. Zilka
Registration No. 41,429

P.O. Box 721120
San Jose, CA 95172-1120
408-505-5100